

## CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Hannah Sampson	Team: Squad #7	CCRB Case #: 201905807	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Thursday, 06/27/2019 10:45 AM	Location of Incident: Intersection of Hylan Boulevard and Holten Avenue	Precinct: 123	18 Mo. SOL 12/27/2020	EO SOL 8/13/2021	
Date/Time CV Reported Tue, 07/02/2019 5:42 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: On-line website	Date/Time Received at CCRB Tue, 07/02/2019 5:42 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. DT3 Sergio Hernandez	00131	926947	NARCBSI
2. POM Nicholas Rentas	21556	937357	NARCBSI
3. DT3 Mathew Reich	00122	933211	NARCBSI

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.DT3 Mathew Reich	Abuse: Detective Mathew Reich stopped the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.	
B.POM Nicholas Rentas	Abuse: Police Officer Nicholas Rentas stopped the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.	
C.DT3 Sergio Hernandez	Abuse: Detective Sergio Hernandez stopped the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.	
D.DT3 Mathew Reich	Abuse: Detective Mathew Reich threatened to issue a summons to § 87(2)(b)	
E.DT3 Mathew Reich	Abuse: Detective Mathew Reich threatened to seize § 87(2)(b)'s property.	
F.DT3 Mathew Reich	Abuse: Detective Mathew Reich searched the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.	
G.DT3 Mathew Reich	Discourtesy: Detective Mathew Reich acted discourteously toward § 87(2)(b)	

### Case Summary

On July 2, 2019, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint with the CCRB online on behalf of himself and his wife, § 87(2)(b). The CCRB does not have any video footage of this incident.

On July 8, 2019, a letter and email were sent to § 87(2)(b) and a voice message was left on his cell phone number requesting a call back. The same day, § 87(2)(b) contacted the CCRB using his home phone number. However, he did not leave a message. A call was returned to § 87(2)(b)'s home number and the call connected to a beeping tone. The same day, § 87(2)(b) called back, provided a phone statement, and was scheduled for an interview at the CCRB on July 15, 2019. The morning of July 15, 2019, § 87(2)(b) contacted the CCRB and asked to reschedule his appointment because his wife, § 87(2)(b) was in a car accident and he was also feeling unwell. § 87(2)(b) rescheduled his appointment for July 22, 2019. On July 20, 2019, an automated text message was sent to § 87(2)(b) reminding him of his appointment. On July 22, 2019, § 87(2)(b) failed to appear for his interview. On July 25, 2019, and July 29, 2019, calls were placed to both of § 87(2)(b)'s phone numbers and messages were left requesting a call back to reschedule his missed appointment. A missed appointment letter and email were also sent to § 87(2)(b) on July 25, 2019. On August 2, 2019, a call was placed to § 87(2)(b)'s cell phone and a voice message was left requesting a call back. On August 6, 2019, a call was placed to § 87(2)(b)'s home number. § 87(2)(b) answered the call and confirmed her involvement in this incident. She provided a phone statement and said that § 87(2)(b) was in the hospital which was causing the delay in his responsiveness to the CCRB's contact attempts. She stated that she would inform § 87(2)(b) of the call and confirmed that she would appear with § 87(2)(b) for an interview whenever he chose to reschedule it for.

On August 19, 2019, a call was placed to § 87(2)(b)'s cell phone. He answered the call and said he missed his appointment due to health complications. § 87(2)(b) said that he still wished to proceed with his complaint but that his health and numerous doctors' appointments made scheduling an interview difficult. As a result, § 87(2)(b) was offered the option to submit a notarized statement. § 87(2)(b) agreed and the directions for the statement were sent to him via standard mail and email on August 20, 2019. On August 28, 2019, a call was placed to § 87(2)(b)'s cell phone to follow-up on the notarized statement and a message was left requesting a call back. A call was also placed to the § 87(2)(b)'s shared home number and a message was left requesting a call back. On September 3, 2019, a call was placed to § 87(2)(b)'s personal cell phone number and a message was left requesting a call back to schedule her for an interview. Letters were mailed to § 87(2)(b) on September 3, 2019, and September 9, 2019. On September 9, 2019, a call was placed to § 87(2)(b)'s cell phone. She answered the call but said she could not talk and would call back when she had a chance. Two additional calls were placed to § 87(2)(b)'s cell phone number and the § 87(2)(b)'s shared home number on September 18, 2019, and September 27, 2019. With all calls, a message was left requesting a call back. The same day, a call was placed to § 87(2)(b)'s cell phone. § 87(2)(b) answered the call and said he was willing to schedule an interview rather than submit a notarized statement. However, he did not know his schedule at the time of this call and said he would contact the CCRB on the morning of September 30, 2019 to provide his availability. On October 1, 2019, a fifth call was placed to § 87(2)(b)'s cell phone number and a message was left requesting that she contact the CCRB to schedule an interview. To date, neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) has contacted the CCRB to schedule an interview and a search of the DOC for NYC database confirmed that § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) are not incarcerated. § 87(2)(g)

Squad No.: \_\_\_\_\_

Investigator:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Squad Leader:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date